

UTAH WILDLIFE BOARD MEETING
Tuesday, November 22, 2005 - 9:30 a.m.
DNR Auditorium, 1594 West North Temple
Salt Lake City, Utah

AGENDA

- | | | |
|-----|---|--------------------|
| 1. | Approval of Agenda
- Dr. Jim Bowns, Chair | ACTION |
| 2. | Approval of Minutes
- Dr. Bowns | ACTION |
| 3. | Old Business (Action Log)
- Dick Diamond, Vice-Chair | CONTINGENT |
| 4. | Division Update
- Jim Karpowitz, DWR Director | INFORMATION |
| 5. | Bucks & Bulls Proclamation & Rule R657-5
- Craig McLaughlin, DWR Big Game Program Coordinator | ACTION |
| 6. | Lifetime Hunting & Fishing License Rule R657-17 5-yr. Review
- Craig McLaughlin | ACTION |
| 7. | Big Game CWMUs & Permit Numbers
- Ron Hodson, DWR CWMU Program Coordinator | ACTION |
| 8. | Conservation Permit Numbers
- Alan Clark, Wildlife Section Chief | ACTION |
| 9. | Dedicated Hunter Program Rule R657-38 & Fees Rule R-657-42
- Jill West, DWR Volunteer Program Coordinator | ACTION |
| 10. | Hunter Education Program Rule R657-23 nonresident blue card fee
- Lenny Rees, DWR Hunter Education Program Coordinator | ACTION |
| 11. | Minimum Hunting Age Proposed Changes
- Lenny Rees | ACTION |
| 12. | Variance Requests
- Judi Tutorow, DWR Licensing Program Coordinator | ACTION |

13. Other Business

CONTINGENT

UTAH WILDLIFE BOARD MOTIONS

Tuesday, November 22, 2005 - 9:30 a.m.
DNR Auditorium, 1594 West North Temple
Salt Lake City, Utah

1. Approval of Agenda **ACTION**

MOTION: I move that we accept the agenda as presented.

Passed unanimously

2. Approval of Minutes **ACTION**

MOTION: I move that we approve the Wildlife Board meeting minutes for October 6, 2005 with the noted changes and corrections.

Passed unanimously

3. Bucks & Bulls Proclamation & Rule R657-5 **ACTION**

MOTION: I move that we retain the five day hunts in Southern and Southeastern Regions and the nine days in the other three regions.

Passed four to two with Dick Diamond and Paul Niemeyer opposed.

MOTION: I move that we retain the statewide archery hunt for 2006.

Passed four to two with Lee Howard and Rick Woodard opposed.

MOTION: I move that the Divisions look at Don Peay's recommendation on the statewide archery for next year and run this through the RACs.

Passed unanimously

MOTION: I move that we should leave the Sanpete County archery hunt boundary as it was in 2005.

Passed unanimously

MOTION: I move that we add Stansbury Mountain to the transplant sites where California Bighorn sheep might be transplanted.

Passed unanimously

MOTION: I move that we ask the Division to look into the ideas

presented by the Northern RAC relative too perhaps a split muzzleloader deer season or a concurrent deer and elk hunt, looking for options to address crowding problems during the hunts. These ideas will be brought back through the RACs and to the Wildlife Board at a future date.

Passed unanimously

MOTION: I move that the Division and the Utah Bowman=s Association discuss the proposed recommendations and come up with specifics to be taken through the RACs and back to the Wildlife Board.

Passed unanimously

MOTION: I move that we allow people to pick up full skulls as long as they check in with the Conservation Officers in the area, and that this item be run through the RACs and brought back to the Wildlife Board.

Passed unanimously

MOTION: I move that as money and manpower becomes available, the Division will implement mandatory reporting on all big game hunts.

Passed unanimously

MOTION: I move that we accept the remainder of the Bucks & Bulls Proclamation & Rule R657-17.

Passed unanimously

4. Lifetime Hunting & Fishing License Rule R657-17 5-yr. Review **ACTION**

MOTION: I move that we accept the Division=s recommendations on the Lifetime Hunting & Fishing License Rule R657-17 five year review.

Passed unanimously

5. Big Game CWMUs & Permit Numbers **ACTION**

MOTION: I move that we accept the additional acreage of Ivan Fidel on the Mini Maude CWMU.

Passed with one abstention by Allan Smith

MOTION: I move that we reactivate the CWMU Committee to review the CWMU Rule.

Passed unanimously

MOTION: I move that we accept the big game CWMU recommendations.

Passed with one abstention by Allan Smith

MOTION: I move that we accept the remainder of the Division=s recommendations on the Landowner Permits Association numbers and that the Indian Peaks Landowner elk permits become premium permits.

Passed four to two with Dick Diamond and Allan Smith opposed.

6. Conservation Permit Numbers

ACTION

MOTION: I move that we grant the request of FNAWS for two 2006 permits, one for the Little Rockies and one for the New Foundland Mountains.

Passed unanimously

MOTION: I move that we accept the Conservation Permit Numbers as presented by the Division.

Passed with one abstention, Allan Smith

7. Dedicated Hunter Program Rule R657-38 & Fees Rule R-657-42

ACTION

MOTION: I move that we accept the Dedicated Hunter Program Rule R657-38 and Fees Rule R-657-42 as presented by the Division, but retain the RAC meeting requirement.

Passed unanimously

8. Hunter Education Program Rule R657-23 nonresident blue card fee **ACTION**

MOTION: I move that we accept the Hunter Education Program Rule R657-23 nonresident blue card fee.

Passed unanimously

9. Minimum Hunting Age Proposed Changes

ACTION

MOTION: I move that electronic devices not be used as a substitute for direct (face to face) verbal communication relative to

supervision of youth hunters.

Passed unanimously

MOTION: I move that we accept the Minimum Hunting Age Proposed Changes as presented by the Division.

Passed unanimously

10. Variance Requests

ACTION

MOTION: I move that we grant the extension of the 2005 any weapon Paunsaungunt buck deer permit for Gregg Abdoe.

Passed unanimously

MOTION: I move that we grant the extension of the 2005 Mt. Dutton any weapon bull elk permit for Robert Phelps.

Passed unanimously

MOTION: I move that we grant the extension of the 2005 antlerless deer, West Bear River permit for Christopher Abkarian.

Passed unanimously

MOTION: I move that we grant the extension of the 2005 Zion (b) Merriam=s turkey permit for Gary A. Hill.

Passed unanimously

MOTION: I move that we grant the extension of the 2005 Northern Region general buck deer permits for Mike and Michael Mccarey.

Passed unanimously

MOTION: I move that we grant the extension of the 2005 Central and Southern Region Conservation Cougar permits for Hector and Wanda Gonzalez.

Passed unanimously

11. Other Business - Ken Sheldon Stipulation

MOTION: I move that we grant the stipulation for Ken Sheldon, reducing his suspension from 365 days to 171 days.

Passed unanimously

UTAH WILDLIFE BOARD MEETING
Tuesday, November 22, 2005 - 9:30 a.m.
DNR Auditorium 1594 West North Temple
Salt Lake City, Utah

Board Members Present

Dr. Jim Bowns, Chair
Dick Diamond
Allan Smith
Jim Karpowitz, Executive Secretary
Paul Niemeyer
Lee Howard
Keele Johnson
Rick Woodard

RAC Chairs Present

Northern - Ernie Perkins
Southern - Mike Small
Northeastern - Clay Hamann
Central - Ed Kent
Southeastern - Jim Gilson

Public Present

Don Peay
Tony Abbott
John Bair
Byron Bateman
Clint Frederickson
Wes Shields
Gregg McGregor
Ron Perkins
Jack Sheffey
Garth Carter

Division of Wildlife Resources

Steve Phillips
Judi Tutorow
Robyn Pearson
LuAnn Petrovich
Mark Hadley
Doug Messerly
Nile Sorenson
Derris Jones
Bob Hasenyager
Dave Hintze
Walt Donaldson
Bill Bates
Craig McLaughlin
Ron Hodson
Jill West
Lenny Rees
Alan Clark
Anis Aoude
Boyde Blackwell
Justin Dolling

Jason Carter
William Fenimore
Jon Leonard

Chairman Bowns welcomed the audience and introduced the Wildlife Board members and RAC Chairs. The agenda was then reviewed with the addition of Aother business.@ The WAFWA meeting will be discussed under Aother business.@ The addresses and phone numbers of the Wildlife Board members are available, but they each need to check to make sure all information is current. This is especially important to improve communication. Mr. Niemeyer would like to have a discussion on being able to pick up complete skulls. Director Karpowitz said that is in the rule and could be part of the Bucks and Bulls agenda item.

1) Approval of Agenda (Action)

The following motion was made by Paul Niemeyer, seconded by Rick Woodard and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the agenda as presented.

2) Approval of the Minutes (Action)

On p. 5, Dick Diamond (excused) was added to the roll. P. 22, 8th paragraph, it should read Adoes not@ on the first line. P. 24, 1st paragraph last line, eliminate Adid@ before Ahas.@ On p. 27, specify AState Senator Tom Hatch.@

The following motion was made by Allan Smith, seconded by Lee Howard and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the Wildlife Board meeting minutes for October 6, 2005 with the noted changes and corrections.

3) Old Business (Action Log) (Contingent)

Mr. Diamond said unless Director Karpowitz has any specific action to brief the Wildlife Board on, in the interest of time with the agenda, there is not anything that could not wait until the next meeting.

Director Karpowitz said the Division has taken on several of the action log items. Archery deer tags will be under discussion again today. The Division met with the committee in San Juan County concerning the process for revision of a unit management plan relative to the San Juan County Elk Management Plan. It was a very productive meeting and they will continue to work

with that group. The Division has been working with AFarmers and Hunters Feeding the Hungry@ and has made room in the proclamation for their ad, telling hunters how they can donate meat.

There have been wolf sightings in the Northern and Northeastern Utah and wolf control training is in progress. We are continuing to monitor this situation. The Division has made some changes in getting information to the RACs and the public. This was discussed at length at the training session yesterday.

Mr. Diamond said the Division should give notice to those who might be affected by a wolf sightings.

Director Karpowitz said the way the process works is when we get a sighting, whether it is by a Division person or the public, they follow up with Wildlife Services, go out to the area, look for tracks, do howling surveys and try to find the wolves. If they can get more documentation than just the sighting, then it is confirmed. They are following up on two sightings presently, one in Cache County in the last few days and one out by Flaming Gorge in the Sheep Creek area that they have been working on for about a month. Transient wolves come and go, and sometimes it requires more than just a sighting, because of the chance that it might be a wolf hybrid.

Mr. Johnson commented on the San Juan Elk Management Plan. He expressed appreciation to Director Karpowitz for his efforts. The meeting went until 9 p m and it was a very productive meeting. Mr. Don Peay was also in attendance. The extra time and effort was appreciated.

Mr. Diamond said once the action log has been established, sometimes it is just an information update and other times it might require action which would include a briefing. Normally it does not require any action, but is a reporting of the process within the Division.

4) Division Update (Information)

Director Karpowitz distributed a report by the DNR on law enforcement within the department.

It lists the positive steps that have been taken by the DWR and Parks and Recreation to improve law enforcement in the state. The news media has ignored many of the positive things that are happening presently. This report is to help update the public. There has been a total change in personnel with Mike Fowlks being the new Law Enforcement Chief. There have been many unsolicited compliments received by the Division about our officers around the state. Those never seem to reach the newspapers. Our officers are doing a great job and are taking steps toward improving their image and the way they do law enforcement.

The other issue is relative to the Bill Gephardt report on Channel 2 which addressed the fact that the Division sells licenses to felons. That is a true statement, in that we do not restrict anyone from buying a license, however felons and other restricted persons cannot possess firearms to put that license into effect. The part of this scenario that did not get put out through the media is that if it becomes illegal for a felon, or other restricted person to buy a hunting license, then background checks would have to be put into effect. The Division does not have the time or resources to do background checks or extensive law enforcement work in this area. This is an unreasonable request, to ask that the 99% of the law abiding citizens in the state wait for a background check before they can purchase a hunting license. Nevertheless, the Division has taken some steps toward making changes in the way they do business. When a turkey tag, or big game tag is applied for online, the applicant will see a list of who restricted people are and a statement that he understands that if they are on that list, it is illegal to use a firearm in the state of Utah. This information has to be read and checked before they actually get to the application screen. This will clarify what the current law is relative to this subject. The Division will also continue to provide a list of hunters to the Department of Corrections every year and they will compare this list to their list of some 20,000 people that are currently in their system. They can run a check and if any of those people have purchased a license, they will go to them and inform them that they cannot use the license. If they choose to surrender it or not, they will be watching. The Division is going to be more active in investigations. Once they get a list of who is a felon in the state, it will be checked against people who have reported harvest, particularly on limited entry and once-in-a-lifetime permits. If they are restricted persons and have reported harvest, there will be an investigation initiated. We hope that legislation is not run to make it illegal for these restricted persons to buy a license, because it could create an unfair burden on the public.

Director Karpowitz said he is very proud of our Law Enforcement in the Division. There will be several of the older employees retiring the end of this year and there will be a much younger law enforcement force. The Division is looking for the type of officer with the philosophy that matches that of the leadership within the department. We have some very good candidates and they are all top notch individuals. There are a number of other issues, but because of the agenda, we will leave those until the next meeting. If there are any questions, he would be glad to address them.

5) Bucks & Bulls Proclamation & Rule R657-5 (Action)

Craig McLaughlin, DWR Big Game Program Coordinator, presented this agenda item. He said he is new to this position and this is his first time through this process. There has been less discussion on this issue than he expected and this is most likely due to the fact that the Division has recently developed Deer and Elk Management Plans. He then went over a timeline on the

process of the Bucks and Bulls Proclamation. The Wildlife Board will approve the 2006 general season dates and hunts at this meeting today. The big game application period will be from January 17 through February 26, 2006. The Wildlife Board approves limited entry permit numbers in March and April 2006, so this meeting will primarily cover seasons and hunt dates.

The 2006 deer hunt recommendations are driven by post season buck:doe ratios through general season public land units. A three year average is used. A chart was presented illustrating buck:doe ratio trends from 1998-2004 and the 15 buck per 100 does has been maintained in most areas. A slide on fawn production trends for 1998-2004 showed there was a low spot in 2002 and it has been increasing ever since. Trends in the general season buck deer harvest were discussed and it has followed fawn production trends.

Dr. McLaughlin then presented the 2006 deer recommendations and 2006 general deer season dates, including archery, 8/19-9/15, muzzleloader, 9/27-10/5, any weapon 10/21-10/29, and a nine day season statewide. Permit caps will be set in spring. There is one boundary change recommended with a slight adjustment of the Wasatch Front extended archery area, in which the south western corner of the unit is removed, an area where there has been conflict with the archers in some built up areas.

In the Southeast RAC, there was a request from hunters for increased hunting opportunity on a portion of the Henry Mountains Unit. The current status of that area is limited entry and the DWR is recommending no change from that. The concern is the impact on deer that might be migrating into this area from the nearby Elk Ridge Unit. If a change is considered they would recommend creating a subunit with an early season limited entry hunt.

Hunter crowding issues were then discussed. The Northern RAC has asked the Division to look at this problem. The Northern Region staff did a survey and the results said there were not enough deer, not enough bucks, and too many hunters. The Division's recommendation is to continue on the path of improving habitat conditions and watching deer herds improve with increased range and weather conditions. There is no need for a major change in hunting regulations in Northern Region.

The Southern RAC asked the Division to address crowding problems during the archery deer hunt, considering the issue of statewide verses regional permits for archery.

Dr. McLaughlin then presented some information on this issue. He said that most of deer in each region are taken during rifle season. He then showed a harvest chart illustrating archery, muzzleloader and any weapon deer harvest by region. In each region, archery is the smallest component of the overall harvest. The Division looked at archery hunter days on a square mile

basis of deer habitat. Central Region showed a higher effort (number of days afield) in the last two years. Southern and Southeast regions were higher than Northern and Northeast, but dramatically less than Central. There are several reasons for this. First of all, most of the population is in Central Region and there is the extended archery on the Wasatch. Dedicated Hunters are hunting more in Southern Region and a graph showing Dedicated Hunter and total archery hunting effort per square mile of deer habitat in 2004 was shown. There does not seem to be a crowding issue based on this information and there is no need to go to a regional archery permit.

Next, the 2006 General Elk season hunt dates and permit caps were presented with archery 8/24-9/15, spike only 10/7-10/15, any bull 10/7-10/19, youth any bull 9/16-9/26, and muzzleloader 11/1-11/9. Archery elk permits are unlimited, spike bull permit cap 11,000, any bull permit cap 14,300 and the youth any bull at 300.

Dr. McLaughlin then went over other recommended changes in elk seasons, including the opening of Pine Valley Unit as an any bull hunt. There have been some depredation issues in this area. Another change was the deletion of the Nebo West Desert extended archery hunt, because it did not accomplish the intent of the Division. It had issues with trespass of hunters onto private lands and concern about moving elk onto the interstate, causing safety issues. He then discussed boundary change recommendations.

2006 pronghorn recommendations were then addressed, including a new hunt unit in the Kaiparowitz. The population there was started by transplant, has now reached 150 animals, and can now support a hunt.

On the 2006 Once-in-a-Lifetime recommendations, they are recommending a new hunt unit on Rocky Mountain Bighorn sheep in the Newfoundland Mountains. That population has grown to support a hunt, as has the population on the Little Rockies Unit in the Henry Mountains for Desert Bighorn sheep. The Rocky Mountain Goat recommendation would be for an additional hunt on the Willard Peak unit, female only to control the population.

Several other changes have been requested during the RAC process. One is the reauthorization of the bighorn sheep transplant list with the addition of the Stansbury Mountains as a release site. Also a boundary change for the bighorn sheep hunt on the North Slope Three Corners Bare Top area. By removing the eastern area, it will allow for protection of some Montana sheep that were transplanted in 2004.

It is recommended by PRC that the application process for premium limited entry, limited entry, CWMU and OIAL permits reflect a change in wording for R657-5-24 that would have the

individuals specify up to two hunt number choices. Previously it had been up to five choices. This completed the presentation. Dr. McLaughlin added that he knows there will be some questions on archer numbers in each unit. Of the 15,000 archers during the deer season, just over 3,100 hunt in Northern, 1,700 hunt in Northeast, 2,500 in Central, 3,000 in Southeast, and 5,000 in Southern.

Mr. Johnson is concerned on the 15-20 ratios on some units, and asked if there are some hot spots in the regions that do not show up on the average. He feels that we need to go in and address those specific areas, such as going to a four point or better in areas where things are hit hard. This could be done on the Abajoes, because of the amount of hunting that takes place there.

Mr. McLaughlin said Mr. Johnson's comment has merit, but they are looking to ride out the management plan. We need to give the plan time to work. It is difficult to manage in very small areas and it would take a lot of resources that we do not have. We are managing at a level that lets us address herd needs, but we cannot go into small areas with present resources.

Bill Bates said they do not include buck:doe ratios off of limited entry units or CWMUs in that average. It is based on general open areas.

Chairman Bowns asked if there were any questions

Jim Gilson asked Dr. McLaughlin to go over archery tag distribution numbers that were given at the end of the presentation. When was it gathered and how?

Dr. McLaughlin said he would give the numbers to him. The information was from 2004. These numbers reflect where the hunters actually hunted.

Chairman Bowns asked Dr. McLaughlin to restate the numbers.

Dr. McLaughlin said they were as follows: Northern - 3,117, Northeast - 1,997, Southeast - 3,227, Central- 3,655, Southern 5,427 and 230 unknown archery hunters. The Division surveyed archery hunters by phone. Of the Dedicated Hunters, 883 out of almost 2000 hunted in Southern Region which is 48%.

Mr. Niemeyer asked about hunter density in deer habitat. August and September deer location does not tell all about deer habitat. We need to refine the definition of deer habitat.

Dr. McLaughlin said it is habitat that has been identified by the Division as being occupied by deer for the planning process.

Mr. Peay asked if the Division contacted any of the landowners on moving the Sanpete elk boundary back to where it was in 2004.

Anis Aoude said they were contacted by several landowners and sportsmen.

Mr. Peay said the problem was that elk were coming down along the highway. There was an effort to move them off the highway. There are at least two landowners with about 10,000 acres and they are managing their land primarily for elk and deer. They have pulled a lot of elk and deer up off the highway. When the extended archery boundary was moved up against their boundary, hunters would trespass and push the elk out onto the open land so they could get a shot at them. Because of that problem, the boundary was moved and now the proposal is to move it right back. Mr. Peay was disappointed that the Division did not contact landowners to coordinate with what they are trying to accomplish.

RAC Recommendations

Northern - Mr. Perkins thanked the Northern Region and the Salt Lake Office for the hunter crowding survey. They sent out 1,600 surveys and got approximately 600 back. They floated five proposals that would reduce deer hunting during the general hunt on the public land units. The conclusion from all of it is that the public disagrees on what ought to be done. There are perceptions of crowding. There were several ideas that have merit to reduce crowding. Their RAC had two motions to address this. MOTION: The Division look at a concurrent high country premium deer and elk hunt permits, reducing the Northern Region any weapon deer hunt numbers by the same number. Also with a recommendation for comparable consideration of a muzzleloader hunt, intended to do the same thing. MOTION: Recommending a Northern Region only test of a split muzzleloader season, adding a second five day season, November 2nd - 6th. That would make the muzzleloader hunt more attractive and would reduce people out of the any weapon hunt. Both of these motions carried unanimously. The third MOTION: Northern Region and RAC form a committee to look at the Cache Unit deer herd and deer hunt management. - carried unanimously. The fourth MOTION: To accepted the remainder of the Bucks and Bulls as presented by the Division -failed through lack of a second. The group wanted to reconsider the more than twelve proposals that had been received from the public. They went through them and no action was taken. The remainder of the Bucks and Bulls was approved unanimously.

Central - Mr. Kent said one action was to amend the bighorn transplant list to include a transplant onto the Stansbury Island range. This passed unanimously. Chad Piper from Utah Bowman=s brought a proposal to the Central RAC that identified several concerns. At this time,

the RAC recommended MOTION: The Division work with the UBA, looking toward some recommendations relative to these concerns. There is definitely some merit in these issues, but they did not have enough time and information to work on these as a RAC. This passed unanimously. Another motion was made by John Bair. MOTION: The Central RAC continue to support the statewide archery hunt. This was based on the numbers made in the presentation which they do not feel illustrate an overcrowding issue statewide, particularly in the Southern Region- passed unanimously. The last motion was MOTION: To accept the balance of proclamation and rule as presented - passed 6 to 1.

Southern - Mr. Small said they had three motions that passed. MOTION: To maintain the five day general deer hunt - passed 4 to 3. It was pointed out that the quality of the hunt is a big concern, because of the number of hunters. Reducing the time might not help the quality issue. This was part of the reason for the split vote. It was also pointed out that in the smaller communities, it is better to have a longer hunt. MOTION: To not have a statewide archery hunt, but use a regional cap on permits. The general feeling is that the Southern Region gets a disproportionate number of archery hunters. The summary of motions is not correct in that it says they voted to reduce the archery hunt by one week. They did vote on this, but it did not pass. MOTION: To accept the remainder of the recommendation from the Division.

Northeastern - Mr. Hamann said they had significant discussion on the change of boundary on the Anthro Mountains. The landowners were especially against it. They ended up with MOTION: To accept the Division's recommendations as presented, passed 7 to 1. There was also discussion on over crowding. Mr. Hamann suggests that overcrowding is not a function of statistics, but rather a function of hunters in the field. If hunters feel they are overcrowded in the field, they are looking for a better quality experience. Their RAC also talked about ideas to reduce crowding, including a split season. This would reduce the number of people on the mountain at any given time.

Southeastern - Mr. Gilson said the first MOTION: To remain with a five day deer hunt, based on comments from region. All units are below objective. They also discussed a statewide archery tag and the crowding issue. MOTION: To reduce the general archery season by one week, based on limited entry elk hunters and competition with archery hunters. This would increase their opportunity. The archers would still be able to hunt the extended Wasatch hunt. This motion passed. MOTION: All general season deer tags be allocated to the regions, based on deer populations - passed with two opposed. MOTION: To not act on UBA proposals that fell outside Southeastern Region - passed unanimously. MOTION: To table the UBA proposal relative to permit incentives - passed with four opposed. MOTION: To reject all of UBA proposals - passed unanimously. MOTION: To accept the remainder of the Bucks and Bulls as presented by Division - passed unanimously.

Mr. Diamond asked for clarification on reducing the archery hunt by one week. Sending hunters over to the extended Wasatch hunt and limiting by region would be contradictory, would it not?

Mr. Gilson said the extended archery season would not be limited to region. Anybody could hunt the extended units.

Mr. Johnson said on the Pine Valley any bull recommendation, his philosophy is to manage elk with spike only hunts. We need to look to eliminate any bull permits and move toward spike only hunts.

Chairman Bowns asked which Pine Valley is being discussed.

Mr. Messerly said Pine Valley WMA which is generally in Washington County with parts of Iron County included, the area west of I-15. This unit has an elk herd objective of 50 animals. They conducted a meeting with sportsmen, livestock operators, USFS and the BLM early in the year. There were numerous people there and they were in general agreement that we maintain the management strategy on this unit. It calls for an objective of 50 elk total. Rather than set the objective at zero, this would allow for a few animals without having to jump to any major actions, however, it is clear from this meeting and others that the Pine Valley Mountains is not a good place to try to build an elk herd. They estimate that there are about 50 animals on the unit. The Board authorized 20 cow permits on this unit and the hunt is presently in process. There are two to six bulls on the unit and a handful of bulls that need to be harvested if we are going to stay at this objective. This unit has influx from the Zion Unit, and the Southwest Desert. There will always be a few bulls coming onto the unit. Spike only hunts would be redundant. There are not enough spikes to make it worth anyone's time. Whatever strategy is applied to this herd of 50 elk is not going to make a lot of difference.

Chairman Bowns said he does not remember this coming up at the RAC meeting. Did the Southern RAC approve this part of it?

Mr. Small said he does not believe Pine Valley was discussed in the Southern RAC, but it was accepted in the final motion. This was not a big issue to them. The Division did present it.

Mr. Diamond told Mr. Perkins that the problem with the Cache unit is that it is so big. If a group does look at this, they need to consider both sides with Wellsville and Riche county out of it. The dynamics of having those other ranges included in trying to manage it makes all the difference. It should not be considered as one. When we moved the muzzleloader early, it was done with a lot of public input, as well as the biological situation of getting it out of the rut.

There was a lot of positive input on the early hunt. Who wants this to split the muzzleloader and create the late season?

Mr. Perkins said there is a split in the group. The split muzzleloader deer hunt season might be a good answer. Running a concurrent deer/elk hunt might be desirable to some people. Both of these options would reduce the crowding on the rifle hunt. These are both options that could be pursued that would have both financial advantages and crowding advantages in the Northern Region. There was also some discussion of whether to wait until the 2007 revision. It might be advantageous doing some small tests next year with some of these ideas.

Mr. Diamond asked if the science of hunting during the rut has changed.

Mr. McLaughlin said no. They still prefer not to manage for hunting during the rut.

Mr. Niemeyer said that November 6th would most likely still be just before the rut.

Mr. Perkins said it would move the hunt toward the rut, but it would not go into that period.

Public Comment

Garth Carter from Cedar City, representing himself, said that on the hunter orange, they would like to see it not required on limited entry hunts, but required on the general deer and elk hunts.

Gregg McGregor, from Santa Clara asked what the criteria is on having a regional agenda item verses a statewide item, regarding the five day deer hunt. Pine Valley was the first mistake to gravitate in that direction. Three of the RACs went with the nine day hunt. Two went to the five day. When Pine Valley went to the five day deer hunt, did the people in the Northern Region even discuss this?

Director Karpowitz said that what the RACs are voting on is a nine day season statewide and to let the RACs depart from that if they want to.

Mr. McGregor said he is representing the chapter chairs for the Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife (SFW). It was consensus that they wanted to continue with the five day mule deer any weapon season. They also recommend eliminating the last week of the mule deer archery season, but this did not pass the Southern RAC. The archers need to make concessions along with others. The archery hunters are not having opportunity restricted. When the Division has the youth draw, they need to pick a region and hunt all three seasons. Dedicated Hunters pick a region and hunt all three seasons. The OIAL pick a region before the general draw. The numbers bear out that

most of these groups pick the Southern Region. There is also the statewide archery of which most hunt in the Southern Region. It is not just the archery hunters causing crowding problems. We can do something with a statewide archery hunt. They would also recommend mandatory statewide reporting. It would be done online, directly to the Division.

Clint Frederickson of the Utah Bowman=s Association (UBA) presented several proposals. (See Attachment #1) He said that most of these proposals will become suggestions, because there was not time for a lot of discussion during the RAC process. He does want to touch on two of the proposals. They propose to stop harvesting buck along the Wasatch Front on Oct 31 unless you have harvested a doe before that date. After harvesting a doe, the does can be checked in at a regional office or with a local Division officer and get a signed voucher which would enable the hunter to continue to hunt until December 15th for either sex. The voucher would cost \$25. (See the attachment for rational and further details) The second proposal is to support the Division in finding a system that would create an incentive for anyone taking bowhunter education in a calendar year to be placed in a draw for a limited amount of big game tags. (See attachment for details) UBA also supports the boundary description change on the Wasatch Front Unit.

Don Peay of SFW addressed the Board. There were 21 SFW board members from around the state that spent about five hours grappling with these recommendations. They brought it down to two issues. One is to go with the five day rifle season in Southern and Southeastern Regions. The Division is selling all their tags. There is ample opportunity that will reduce buck harvest and this is where fawn production was the lowest. The other issue is to address the statewide archery. They recommend that archers apply for one region of their choice through the normal draw. The Division would allocate the archery permits to the regions, based on percentage of deer. The first nine days of the archery season would be by region, the remainder would be statewide. The Division would get more applicants and anyone who drew a unit could still hunt any of the extended seasons anywhere in the state. This would be an excellent solution. The final issue is that they are adamantly opposed to moving the Sanpete boundary back to where it was moved from last year. There is about seven years worth of history on this issue and there have been a lot of meetings. The landowners are managing their property to keep elk and deer off the road. In 2005 the Division moved the boundary five miles south and the landowners were very happy with this. The landowners were not contacted on this proposed change and they do not want the boundary right on their property line. People will come and trespass on their property and push the animals off the property onto the road.

Mr. Niemeyer asked who is actually pushing to move the boundary.

Anis Aoude, Central Region Wildlife Manager, said the reason for moving the boundary is they had some public comment, mainly from archery hunters. Even though the landowners are

allowing and attracting elk to stay on their land, they are also hunting them. A few people pay a certain amount of money and are hunting elk that are baited into the area. There is good food there and they are allowed to remain there. There was a perception that there was an unfair advantage for that landowner. In order to side step that, it was taken out of the unit, but after that all the other landowners in the area started to do the same thing, as in baiting and providing forage for these elk. These elk were holding on the private land where the public could not get to them, so they decided to make a common boundary for everybody. We cannot stop baiting, because it is not illegal in the state.

Mr. Niemeyer asked how they are baiting.

Mr. Aoude said they leave their hay standing in the field to lure them in.

Mr. Johnson said why not leave the boundary where it was. This looks like a management issue, not a hunter issue and it was accomplishing what we wanted it to do. Was it not to keep the elk off the highway?

Mr. Aoude said not just off the highway, but also to decrease depredation problems. We only had it that way for one year and we will continue to keep elk off the highway. The problem is it did not look like a fair change to the public.

Mr. Johnson said this is a safety issue, not something to make archery hunters happy.

Mr. Aoude said it did cut down on accidents, but trespass will always be a problem. People will continue to cut across the area to move the elk. It is a private land issue, and by carving the land out on the boundary change makes it more difficult to handle problems.

Mr. Johnson said they need to catch the trespassers and fine them.

Mr. Aoude said with one or two officers in that big of an area, that is very difficult.

Mr. Howard asked how many complaints they had.

Mr. Aoude said about half a dozen, plus input from the law enforcement officers. We are trying to manage the herd the best we can, keeping depredation problems down and keep public safety as a high priority. The Division recommends that the boundary be put back and it gives us more opportunity to take care of elk problems.

Mr. Smith asked when baiting is referred to, is not the DWR encouraging landowners to provide

forage and habitat? Are you saying that by providing this forage it is baiting?

Mr. Aoude said yes, if they are hunting over that. If hay is provided to have a blind next to it, it is baiting. It is not illegal, but it is happening throughout the unit so why carve out that one landowner?

Director Karpowitz asked that in light of the fact that we now have a November rifle hunt, what would happen if this hunt went away?

Mr. Aoude said we will see how the November hunt comes out, but probably not anything.

Director Karpowitz said that the next issue that has not been mentioned is that Sanpete County is a CWD area. The practice of baiting, feeding, or whatever you want to call it, is playing with fire. If we end up with CWD in those elk, everybody loses. It is well documented that CWD is easily transmitted at feed sights and stations. It is a great concern. If this activity is continued on this unit, we cannot keep having a hunt that condones that.

Mr. Aoude said there was not a lot of public comment when it went through the RAC and more was expected. We can only go with what data we have and our recommendation stands.

Mr. Peay said the landowner is part of a CWMU. They do not issue one late season archery tag. If leaving third crop hay, doing chains, burns and reseed to create more forage to keep elk up off the highway and in good winter condition is baiting, then we have a big problem. He recommends leaving the boundary where it is. Natural forage production and conservation for wildlife should be rewarded, not punished.

John Bair, representing himself, said he talked to some of the smaller landowners and guys that were leasing ground and selling hunts, since the Central RAC meeting. The word he got from about four different individuals was that they felt with the late season hunt, a lot of the pressure is going to be applied to the regular late season elk hunt. They are tired of fighting and they really would not mind if the hunt was eliminated. He also supports the five day season in the Southern and Southeast Regions. He hates to see statewide archery eliminated. He feels we need to give opportunity where we can. Archery allows that and we have a shorter season compared to those across the country. If we have to come to a compromise, what Mr. Peay presented would be workable. If there really is a crowding problem, we might need to alleviate the first weekend or two. We also need to remember that Utah has some of the biggest archery companies in the world, they donate and participate a lot, plus they employ a lot of people.

Board Discussion

Chairman Bowns said they will start with the five day hunt proposal for discussion.

The following motion was made by Keele Johnson, seconded by Lee Howard and passed 4 to two, with Dick Diamond and Paul Niemeyer opposed.

MOTION: I move that we retain the 5 day hunts in Southern and Southeastern Regions and the 9 day in the other three regions.

Mr. Johnson said that the hunters are giving this feedback and if they are willing to give it up, it should happen. He has not found a single person who wants the nine day hunt in Southeastern Region.

Mr. Niemeyer said this is one of the hardest issues to deal with. Die hard hunters are probably for this, but the general public is probably in favor of the nine day. Does this really decrease harvest? Youth only have one day to hunt when this happens, if they go to church. Is it worth it and are we saving any deer? The Southern RAC has voted for this for the last five years.

Director Karpowitz said there is not good evidence either way. Some years it works and others it does not reduce harvest. It is very hard to factor that out with all the other considerations.

Mr. Bates said we do not have conclusive evidence one way or the other. They have seen some changes in the buck:doe ratios, but they cannot tie it to one variable.

Mr. Howard said we must consider the input of the two RACs in favor of this.

Mr. Smith said that the Board created this ratio management tool, but there should be some flexibility. He would like to see the five day hunt go for another season and see if it will help.

Chairman Bowns said the next item is statewide archery. The Southern RAC wants to put it on a regional basis. The Southeast RAC proposed allocating tags on a regional basis. The other three RACs want to retain it statewide.

The following motion was made by Lee Howard, seconded by Rick Woodard and passed four to two, with Keele Johnson and Paul Niemeyer opposed.

MOTION: I move that we retain the statewide archery hunt for 2006.

Mr. Smith said he liked Mr. Peay's suggestion of allowing region by region the first nine days and then going to statewide thereafter. This deserves to be taken through the RAC System.

Mr. Johnson agreed with Mr. Smith.

Mr. Niemeyer said he feels the Board is out of line on this issue. The hunter crowding in that part of the state this time of year is incredible. It is not fair to the hunters, or the wildlife. Beaver Mountain is terribly overcrowded during the archery hunt. We do not have enough area for deer in that area.

The following motion was made by Paul Niemeyer, seconded by Keele Johnson and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that the Division look at Don Peay's recommendation on the statewide archery for next year and run this through the RACs.

Chairman Bowns said the next issue would be reducing the archery hunt by one week. The problem was competition with the archery elk.

The following motion was made by Paul Niemeyer, seconded by Lee Howard and failed 2 to 4, with Dick Diamond, Allan Smith, Rick Woodard and Keele Johnson opposed.

MOTION: I move that we reduce the statewide archery deer hunt by one week, the last week.

Mr. Smith asked if this is passed, would it become effective in 2006?

Chairman Bowns said yes.

Mr. Diamond said we would be cutting a lot of opportunity without all the RACs having input. Southeastern passed this, Southern discussed this, but did not pass it, and the others did not pass it.

Chairman Bowns said the next item is the boundary change in Sanpete County for archery. All of the RACs accepted the Division's recommendations on this issue in their overall approval of the proclamation.

Mr. Woodard said he feels this boundary should be left where it is for safety reasons, keeping the elk off the road.

Mr. Smith said this is one time that new information has come forward at the Board meeting, and the Board is justified in not going with the Division's recommendation. He does not see this

situation as baiting, but feels baiting should be discussed in the future, perhaps when CWMUs are part of the agenda.

The following motion was made by Rick Woodard, seconded by Allan Smith and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we should leave the Sanpete County archery hunt boundary as it was in 2005.

Lunch break

Chairman Bowns excused Jim Gilson from the Southeastern RAC. He had to leave at noon. Derris Jones is sitting in for him.

Chairman Bowns said the next issue is the California bighorn transplant on the Stansbury Mountain site.

Dr. McLaughlin said they are asking for reauthorization of the list of transplant sites to include the addition of Stansbury Mountain.

Mr. Howard asked if this has been cleared with the county commissioners.

Dr. McLaughlin said yes and they are very much in favor of this.

Mr. Diamond asked if Antelope Island is the primary source for this transplant.

Dr. McLaughlin said yes.

The following motion was made by Dick Diamond, seconded by Allan Smith and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we add Stansbury Mountain to the transplant sites where California Bighorn sheep might be transplanted.

Mr. Diamond said in the overcrowding discussion with the Northern RAC, there is no problem with the RAC objecting to the Board sending those ideas to the Division for further review. As they deem that there is a project that could be done next year and all RACs have opportunity to weigh in on this idea, the Northern RAC is fine with it.

The following motion was made by Dick Diamond, seconded by Paul Niemeyer and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we ask the Division to look into the ideas presented by the Northern RAC relative to perhaps a split muzzleloader deer season or a concurrent deer and elk hunt, looking for options to address crowding problems during the hunts. These ideas will be brought back through the RACs and to the Wildlife Board at a future date.

Chairman Bowns said the remaining issues to be discussed are dealing with the UBA=s proposed education course and the discussion on extending the archery.

Mr. Diamond said two major points are if you take the education course you become eligible in a draw and also if you kill a doe first, you can get a buck tag later for \$25.

Chairman Bowns asked Mr. Kent to help clarify on this proposal.

Mr. Kent said there were specific concerns relative to hunting along the Wasatch Front. The tag price, if implemented, would have to be a legislative action. The Central RAC felt they did not have enough information to address these proposals. They recommended that the Division and the UBA get together and hash these issues out. After this process, they would take the recommendations to the RACs and Board in the future.

Chairman Bowns said the Southeastern RAC also wanted more information and they did not support the proposal.

Mr. Johnson said some of the UBA=s proposal should receive some attention. He specifically likes the training proposal and that concept. It needs to be worked on before any action. He particularly liked the education course concept.

The following motion was made by Allan Smith, seconded by Dick Diamond and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that the Division and the Utah Bowman=s Association discuss the proposed recommendations and come up with specifics to be taken through the RACs and back to the Wildlife Board.

Mr. Niemeyer said we still need to discuss the hunter orange issue and picking up full skulls

instead of just antlers.

Mr. Smith said this might be discussed as an option, in the future for all low density hunts, including CWMUs.

Mr. Diamond asked Mr. Bushman what the law says relative to the hunter orange issue.

Mr. Bushman said it is set up in 23-20-21. During any center fire rifle hunt the participants must wear hunter orange, excluding archery, bighorn sheep hunts, mountain goats, statewide conservation permit, or a hunt requiring the hunter to possess a statewide sportsmen's permit. They still must wear hunter orange if a center fire rifle hunt is in progress in the area. The perimeters on hunter orange are set up in code and the Board cannot change that.

Mr. Johnson said we could discuss this and send our recommendations to the legislature.

Director Karpowitz said if the Board feels strongly about this, the Division should look at it before recommendations are sent to the legislature.

Mr. Howard asked if we would be safe saying, if it was during a low density hunt, hunters would not have to wear hunter orange.

Mr. Bushman said no, there are a few exclusions, but if it is a center fire rifle hunt, it is required.

Director Karpowitz said he would like to hear from Mr. Rees, our Hunter Safety Coordinator.

Lenny Rees said he has some statistics available on this issue. In the last five years, we have had seven accidents where a hunter was out of sight or swinging on game. All of those accidents occurred during small game or muzzleloader hunts where hunter orange was not required. In the last five years we have had one accident where hunter orange was being worn. This law went into effect in 1973 and there was a slight decrease in that year. A mistaken for game is almost nonexistent at this point and he gives hunter orange credit for that.

Mr. Niemeyer said the law that you cannot pick up a complete skull is in place. It came into effect on the Paunsagunt where people were poaching big elk and deer then going back for the skull, putting a cape on it and mounting it. Right now we are penalizing the honest people who want to get these skulls. More good could come from a report on dead elk when a skull is found than could be remedied with the law that is in effect.

The following motion was made by Paul Niemeyer, seconded by Dick Diamond and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we allow people to pick up full skulls as long as they check in with the Conservation Officers in the area, and that this item be run through the RACs and brought back to the Wildlife Board.

Chairman Bowns said the next item to be discussed is mandatory reporting on all big game hunts.

Director Karpowitz said the Division is working towards going there, but at this point there is not funding available to put this in place. We will close the books substantially in the hole this year, so we cannot implement right now. Our intention was to start with limited entry and OIAL, then see how it goes. It has gone very well and we plan to expand as funding becomes available. Without a license increase, at this point, it is not going to happen.

The following motion was made by Paul Niemeyer, seconded by Lee Howard and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that as money and manpower becomes available, the Division will implement mandatory reporting on all big game hunts.

Mr. Woodard said there is one more item that needs to be clarified. On our mailing on the Bucks and Bulls recommendations general items, p. 3 of the proclamation, item three, he thinks there is a typo. It says, Aconditions for refunding the amount of license, certificate, or permit@ . . . then down into section four. . .@the license, certificate or permit is surrendered before the end of the season in order to qualify for a refund.@ Shouldn=t that be the start of the season?

Ms. Tutorow said no. That statute was changed last year to accommodate the end of the season. There is a process put into place for that. They must sign an affidavit stating that they have not hunted.

The following motion was made by Dick Diamond, seconded by Rick Woodard and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the remainder of the Bucks & Bulls Proclamation & Rule R657-17.

- 6) Lifetime Hunting & Fishing License Rule R657-17 - 5 year review (Action)

Dr. McLaughlin presented this issue. Relative to the Lifetime Rule, the Division is proposing a change that will allow lifetime license holders the opportunity to complete their questionnaire online and specify their region of preference for the following year. They also may continue to submit a paper questionnaire if that is what they prefer. Lifetime license holders will receive a reminder postcard notifying them of the dates to submit their questionnaire and will be sent a letter confirming receipt of their questionnaire.

RAC Recommendations

Southeastern - Mr. Jones said they had a motion to make lifetime licenses available again and this passed with three dissenting votes. There are people who wished they had bought a lifetime license when available. The rule passed unanimously.

Northeastern, Southern, and Central passed the Division's recommendation unanimously.

Northern - Mr. Perkins said they passed the recommendations unanimously and their RAC would support the Southeastern's recommendation to reopen the sale of lifetime hunting and fishing licenses.

Chairman Bowns asked if there were any questions or comments from the audience and there were none.

Board Discussion

Chairman Bowns said they should address the reopening of the sale of lifetime license.

Mr. Johnson said this is in code and would have to be addressed through the legislature.

The following motion was made by Dick Diamond, seconded by Paul Niemeyer and passed unanimously

**MOTION: I move that we accept the Division's recommendations on the
Lifetime Hunting & Fishing License Rule R657-17 - five year review.**

7) Big Game CWMUs & Permit Numbers

Ron Hodson, DWR CWMU Program Coordinator, presented this agenda item. He first presented a brief overview of the CWMU program. For 2006, 105 applications for CWMUs

were received. 79 of those were renewal applications that have been approved by DWR. The Board must still approve permit numbers for these applications, but there are no disagreements in what has been recommended by the CWMUs and what has been recommended by the Division. There are ten new applications that are being presented for approval and twelve renewal applications that have issues that need to be resolved. There are four applications that are being recommended for denial, three are for renewal and one is new.

If the Division's recommendations are adopted, there will be 101 CWMUs statewide, ten of which are new. He then broke them out by region with 58 in Northern, 18 in Southeastern, 9 in Southern, 10 in Central and 6 in Northeastern. There are just under two million acres enrolled in the program and 96% of that is private land. The total buck and bull permits for the CWMUs would be 2,629 private and 425 for the public, 14% of the total. Mr. Hodson then went on to discuss the permits by species.

Statewide, maps for 2005 were digitized and are available in offices and on the web site. This was a huge effort and it involved a lot of time and effort by the biologists. There was a special effort in 2005, proofing maps, proofing ownership status, compensation for inclusion of public lands through permits or opening other private lands, and identifying definable boundaries. They are looking to conduct a review of the program in the coming year.

Mr. Hodson went on to discuss CWMU application issues by region. In Northern region, Bally Watts has been recommended for denial unless a property dispute is resolved. One of four brothers refuses to sign. Cottonwood has also been recommended for denial, because acreage is noncontiguous and below minimum. More than one third of the property has also changed hands. Twin Peaks has been recommended for probation for the November deer season for failure to meet hunter harvest success rate. Washakie has been recommended for probation for failure to meet hunter harvest success rate. Bear Spring, Chournos Legacy, Clark Canyon and Dove Creek, Jacobs Creek, Junction Valley, and Taylor Farms are new CWMUs that are recommended for approval.

In the Central Region, Coyote Little Pole has been recommended for approval and will be off probation. New CWMUs recommended for approval are Deer Creek, and Heartland West. North Sandpitch has been recommended for denial, because it does not exhibit enforceable boundaries. It also does not meet criteria for approval of a CWMU with under 10,000 acres.

In the Northeastern Region, Moon Ranch asked for 9/1 elk and 1/1 moose. The DWR recommends 6/1 elk and 1/0 moose. Birch Creek has been recommended for denial, because it meets minimum acreage only by adding adjacent public land. Mill Hollow has been recommended for approval as a new CWMU.

In the Southeastern Region, Magnificent Seven has been recommended for denial of the November deer season, because they exceed the hunter density criteria of the surrounding unit. Pace Canyon and Pagano Ranch are recommended for denial for the November deer season for the same reason. Piute Springs is recommended for probation for insufficient posting. Scofield Canyons CWMU asked for 25/3 on deer and the Division is recommending 23/3. Scofield East and Scofield West have been recommended for probation for insufficient posting. Soldier Summit has recommended 14/2 on elk and the Division is at 13/2.

The Southeastern Region has Mini Maude as a new CWMU.

Southern Region has no renewal issues or new CWMUs. This concluded the CWMU portion of the presentation.

Mr. Niemeyer asked about the length of the hunt on the CWMUs.

Mr. Hodson said the CWMU rule does not allow for a later hunt at this time and it ends on October 31, unless they apply for a variance. This is an issue and should be looked at when the rule is reviewed.

Mr. Howard said he went through the CWMUs and almost 70 of them have variances. He is concerned that the Board is granting too many variances.

Mr. Hodson said the November season for deer is not really considered a variance, but it is listed as such. It's not a variance, but an option.

Mr. Diamond said he is very supportive of the program. With the public being only at 14% of the tags, it is hard to sell the program to them.

Mr. Hodson said it is only 14% of the buck and bull tags, but the public gets the majority on the antlerless tags. Most people want to hunt bucks and bulls, but generally there is still quite a lot of public opportunity. There are no plans to change this at present. It works well to help CWMUs run their program and it keeps lands in open space and wildlife habitat.

Mr. Smith said that Mr. Hodson sent out word to all CWMUs in the state, stressing how important it is for them to participate in the antlerless permits. He is encouraging them to step up and support this part of the program.

Mr. Johnson complimented Mr. Hodson on the website, specifically on the maps and

boundaries.

RAC Recommendations

Southern - Mr. Small said they had a lengthy discussion on the CWMUs. He gets more e-mails and letters on CWMU issues than anything else. There was a person at the meeting from the Richfield BLM that said there are no requirements, when the CWMUs are set up, to consult with the BLM on the boundaries. People have come in quite upset that public land is being posted when these are part of CWMUs. The RAC summary says that they voted unanimously to accept this proposal, but that is incorrect. The vote in their RAC was in favor of the Division=s recommendations, 5 to 1, with 1 abstention.

Northeastern - Mr. Hamann said the motion was made to approve the recommendations and it passed 7 to 1

Southeastern - Mr. Jones said they had an individual come to the RAC meeting who wanted to be part of the new Mini Maude CWMU. The RAC allowed for this and a motion was made accordingly. It passed unanimously. The motion was made to accept the remainder of the recommendations and it passed unanimously with one abstention

Central - Mr. Kent said they had two motions on CWMUs. Because of some discussion and concern by the BLM representative that initially when the CWMU Rule and concept was created, there was quite a bit of interaction with private landowners and managers of public lands. In his opinion that coordination and communication has dropped off. The following motion came from that discussion. MOTION: To strongly support a review of the CWMU Rule and process and that the Division includes members of the RAC in that review. Finally, MOTION: To approve the big game CWMUs and permit numbers as presented - passed 6 to 1.

Northern - Mr. Perkins said they had three motions. MOTION: Recommend the Division include all stakeholders in the CWMU program review - passed unanimously. MOTION: Recommend the Wildlife Board approve (a reduction to) 2 CWMU and 1 public moose permits on Foley Ridge CWMU, subject to Division receipt of agreement from all parties - passed 9 for, 1 against, 1 recused. MOTION: Recommend the Wildlife Board approve the remainder of the CWMUs and Permit numbers as presented - passed 9 in favor and 2 recused.

Public Comment

Ken Klegg, President of CWMU Association addressed the Board. He thanked the Board for giving attention to their needs. The Division has been a great ally to this program. There were

more than 20,000 people who put in for deer permits on CWMUs this past year. Their only issue came from the Northern RAC proposal that the public should have input on changes to the program. They completely support the Division in anything they might want to do internally to improve on the program. The Association does have a process in place for the hearing of public sentiment and problems. They want to make sure they are providing quality and ample opportunity for the public. They support the Division's recommendations.

Mr. Johnson said he has a concern on some of the CWMUs. For example on the La Sal mountains, the Division gave cow tags on the public lands. Within four years, there was a total demise of the elk on the public lands during the hunting season and the elk on the CWMU. It ruined a lot of hunting for a lot of people. The numbers were there, but they shifted because of where the pressure was during the cow hunt. If there is no wildlife, the public should not have to sacrifice for CWMUs. If this becomes a problem, it would be grounds for denial of a CWMU. Perhaps the management plan needs to be readdressed, or the number of elk needs to be increased on public lands. It is a very serious problem.

Mr. Smith said he is going to reclude himself from voting on the CWMU issues. He said that in reference to Mr. Johnson's comments, cow hunting is only a tool to manage the population and the suggestion that more hunters be put over on the CWMU would probably not work.

Mr. Johnson said he does not think all CWMUs fall into this, just some specific ones. He would like to see the shift in the cow hunts onto the CWMU and off of the public lands to get the elk herd back to where they normally run.

Mr. Smith said CWMUs take a fair share of the percentage of the total cow permits issued in the area, for population control. Most of the CWMUs are doing what they are supposed to on this issue.

Mr. Klegg said this is a great point. There will be CWMUs within the program that have specific issues. When they set the harvest rates for the CWMU permits, they go back to the management plan. He is aware of the 18,000 acre Redd Ranch CWMU and there are about 180,000 acres of elk habitat on the La Sals. The biologist went through the management plan to get the permit numbers in this area. The La Sals used to be general elk, then spike only, and then limited entry. No doubt, this has changed the dynamics of the elk distribution.

Mr. Johnson said it did not change the dynamic of where the elk herds are. They have moved onto the private lands.

Mr. Klegg asked if there is something from the CWMU side that they can do.

Mr. Johnson said it would have to be addressed from the management plan, perhaps an increase in the number of elk, so they would have what they want on their private lands. We need to build the herd back up on the public lands.

Mr. Howard said we need a review of the CWMUs. The public needs to be getting more tags. We need to also review the variances. This should be a main objective for next year.

Mr. Johnson said he is a very strong supporter of CWMUs.

Chairman Bowns said the Board will address the Southeastern's RACs recommendation on the Mini Maude CWMU.

The following motion was made by Keele Johnson, seconded by Dick Diamond and passed with one abstention, Allan Smith.

MOTION: I move that we accept the additional acreage of Ivan Fidel on the Mini Maude CWMU.

The following motion was made by Lee Howard, seconded by Rick Woodard and it failed Lee Howard in favor and five opposed.

MOTION: I move that we direct the Division to form a committee to review the CWMU program to be taken through the RACs and back to the Wildlife Board.

Mr. Smith said he would suggest they do something similar with the CWMU Program as they did on the Elk Management Plan.

Mr. Hodson pointed out that there is a committee within the CWMU Program. They have two responsibilities, to review conduct and complaints, and second to review the CWMU Program and make recommendations to the Board concerning that.

Mr. Diamond said the committee used to have three RAC Chairs on it and it used to meet regularly.

Mr. Hodson said we have a committee set up already by rule, even though it is not currently constituted. There are supposed to be two sportsmen, two CWMU representatives, one agriculture representative, one at large public representative, and one elected official. I would

think that we could include other people if necessary.

Director Karpowitz said we need to be consistent with this rule. This is the committee we ought to use.

The following motion was made by Allan Smith, seconded Dick Diamond and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we reactivate the CWMU Committee to review the CWMU Rule.

Director Karpowitz said when we did the Elk Committee, we had the basic committee and then we had other people come in and out, that were more observers than participants.

Mr. Smith said that someone from the Wildlife Board could also add to the discussion.

Lee Howard said he would be willing to serve on the committee.

Mr. Diamond said he would like to see a RAC Chairman to be included also.

The following motion was made by Keele Johnson, seconded by Paul Niemeyer and passed with one abstention, Allan Smith.

MOTION: I move that we accept the big game CWMU recommendations.

Chairman Bowns said the 2006 statewide Landowner Association permit recommendations will now be addressed.

Mr. Hodson made this presentation, giving a statewide overview. In 2006, there were sixteen Landowner Associations submit applications. One of those was new in the Southern Region. The total permits requested, if the Division's recommendations are approved, was 109 deer permits, 85 elk permits and seven pronghorn permits. The landowner associations and the DWR agree on eleven of the sixteen applications, but disagree on five of them. Those disagreements total nineteen deer permits, four elk permits and two pronghorn.

Mr. Hodson then went over the landowner association application issues. On the Anthro landowner association, both the DWR and the landowners recommended three elk permits, but are recommending reducing it to two if the Anthro limited entry bull boundary change occurs.

On Elk Ridge the association has requested four deer permits, DWR recommends two. The landowner association has received two permit the past two years and the total permit numbers have not increased. Based on acreage, two permits is adequate.

On Indian Peaks, the association requested four elk permits, and the DWR is recommending two. The landowner qualifies for only two based on the acreage of private land.

On the Panguitch Lake, the association requested seven elk, and the DWR six based on percentage of landowner lands in the unit.

On the Paunsagunt, the association has requested 24 deer and two pronghorn, and the DWR recommends 20 deer and 0 pronghorn.

On the Vernon, the association has requested 33 deer permit and the DWR has recommended 20. This concluded the presentation. If there are any questions on these, the managers are here to answer specific questions.

RAC Recommendations

Northern - Mr. Perkins said there are no landowner associations in their region.

Central -Mr. Kent said they unanimously approved the Division=s recommendations.

Southern - Mr. Small said they did not separate the CWMU and landowner permits and they passed 5 /1 and 1.

Northeastern - Mr. Hamann said they did not separate them and the recommendations passed seven to one.

Southeastern - Mr. Jones said they handled it as one motion. The San Juan Landowner Association did come and asked for more elk and deer permits. The RAC supported the number of permits recommended by the Division for the San Juan LOA.

Public Comment

Garth Carter - Cedar City, representing the Indian Peak Landowners Association said they ask for more elk permits pretty much every year. He is speaking for the landowners and he explained to them that they will not get any more permits unless they can convince the Board that they are doing something that will improve the habitat, not only for cattle, but for the elk,

increasing elk numbers. They called Mr. Carter with some facts that show their improvements. They have built, on various private lands, six and one half miles of water line. They have purchased another 1,180 acres of private land to go into association. They have done approximately 2,200 acres of range improvement through spike treatment or otherwise. They also indicated that there have been six years of drought and some of those ranchers have taken a 50% cut in their cattle, even on their private lands. During that time, they did not ask to have elk numbers cut, and the elk numbers at present are above objective. This LOA would be in favor of more elk. Mr. Carter would like to see a compromise between the Board and this LOA where they do not come back and butt heads every year. They have asked for four permits, or 3 permits, or the 2 permits could be premium tags. Give them something to increase numbers on Indian Peaks and meet them half way. They have done a lot of work and they need recognition for it.

Mr. Smith said every livestock operator has taken reductions through the drought years. There is a formula in determining permit numbers for landowner associations. If we go outside the guidelines, it could change the whole scenario. If we go ahead with additional permits, we will set a precedence in the wrong direction.

Mr. Howard said Indian Peaks has done 2,200 acres in habitat improvement and they deserves some type of compensation. This will create a lot more habitat for elk.

Mr. Johnson mentioned the meeting held in Blanding with the LOA. The Indian Peaks Landowner Association is doing habitat work and they are willing to work on building more habitat and increasing the number of elk opportunities for the public. We need to have a good faith effort with these people. We should move forward first and send a good positive message. He supports giving them one more tag.

Mr. Smith asked about the acreage of this landowner association and the habitat work.

Director Karpowitz said he would like to know what the Division has done on the Habitat Initiative in this area.

Mr. Sorenson said he does not know of the habitat projects that are being spoken of. As far as he knows, the biologist is not aware of them either. The DWR is working with them on sage grouse. If this habitat work had been done, we probably would have known about it. The Division is working on a project on the Mountain Home area, reseeding with the BLM. On our 10,000 acres of Division property, we have done numerous burns and a good number of the elk on that unit utilize this property.

Mr. Messerly said in addition to the things that Mr. Sorenson mentioned, there is a big project

that is planned on a recently converted state lands to private lands, the Blonde Wash area. There is a team working on a mega environmental assessment in the HamlinValley area, in order for us to spend NRCS money and BLM money on big plans in that area. We have a lot of plans for this area. We are glad to have this landowner on record as saying that they support more elk numbers. We want more elk and more opportunity. It is unfortunate if they have done 2,200 acres that they did not involve the DWR, because we could have helped with those programs. We have a good working relationship with this LOA. We do appreciate what they do. We feel like we fairly compensate them with the permits recommended. With two permits, that are \$15,000 permits, if we assume that their land is twice as valuable as the surrounding area, or the elk use it for twice as long, the rate at which we are compensating them with two permits is \$50 per animal unit month. We are supporting them. The compensation we are offering is adequate. We look forward to increasing elk numbers and doing habitat improvements.

Mr. Sorenson said they have 2% of elk acres in that unit and they receive 5% of the total permits on the unit.

Mr. Johnson said he would like to give them one more permit in a good faith act.

Mr. Sorenson said, as a Division they have to stick with the formula. A lot of the CWMU=s and associations have been grandfathered in and the formula does not fit with them. Most of them are getting more than an acre by acre comparison with permits.

Director Karpowitz said this is the same issue as on the San Juan elk unit. All of the individual elk management plans will be revised a year from March. The Board asked the Division to do all of the deer plans first, then the biologists will start on the elk plans for March of 2007. They talked with the San Juan people about incentives for herd expansions. We will continue to pursue that, but we do have guidelines in place presently and we need to follow them. If we want to change these guidelines, it needs to be done in a uniform way that is consistent with the management plans. This is not unique just to this unit.

Mr. Messerly said if there is an increase in permits to the LOA, that will amount to an equivalent decrease in public permits that are issued unit wide. He said what Mr. Carter is asking for is to make the two permits premium so they could hunt all three seasons. That would make the permits more valuable.

Mr. Carter said that it is time for the landowners and the state to work together. It is time for the Division to step forward. He asked again for the one more permit, or make the two permits premium. Give them a directive or incentive to encourage the landowners to continue to make improvements.

Mr. Johnson said if they increase elk numbers, they want the habitat in place.

Mr. Carter said he is also disappointed about the landowners doing projects without the help of the Division. It is time for us to work as a team.

Mr. Niemeyer said this unit is way under on the deer objective. Anything that can be done on habitat would help the deer also. He would like to look at making the permits premium and see what can be done in the future.

Mr. Howard said FNAWS has been very aggressive in looking to the future. He feels we need to look to the future and give them an additional tag, rather than make the two premium.

Mr. Smith said they are already getting two and one half times of what their land acquires. If they allow another tag, we are throwing the entire formula out the window.

Mr. Diamond said we need to stick with the process, rather than give them another tag.

The following motion was made by Keele Johnson, seconded by Lee Howard and it passed 4 to 2, with Dick Diamond and Allan Smith opposed.

MOTION: I move that we accept the remainder of the Division=s recommendations on the Landowner Permits Association numbers and that the Indian Peaks Landowner elk permits become premium permits.

Director Karpowitz said we need more information on this motion. We went through this situation last year. We will have to be able to explain to the other associations why their permits were not premium.

Mr. Johnson said you explain that when a unit comes forward, they should be rewarded. The landowners need to understand that we have given some incentive and the habitat improvements need to happen if we are going to increase elk numbers.

Director Karpowitz said when they created premium tags, they immediately got requests from several units that they wanted the landowner permits to all be premium. This was not the intent of the elk committee. Premium permits were to make up a small percent of the total permits. Director Karpowitz said we need to be careful about the precedence that is being set.

Mr. Niemeyer asked when the improvements were done.

Mr. Carter said most of them were done in the last twelve months. All the landowners were not involved, but around three or four of them called him and gave him the information.

Mr. Woodard said in making those permits premium, the LOA needs to make the Division aware of any habitat improvements that they have made, or are going to make. The Division was not aware of the improvements to this point.

Mr. Niemeyer said he would like to know what was done also.

Mr. Messerly said when they came to the Board two years ago, he told them that one thing the RAC was most concerned about was habitat improvement projects. That was the case when this discussion took place two years ago. He told them that it is important that we work together and the DWR has free money to give you people to help you with projects. That is the strongest incentive that can be offered for them to communicate with the Division. That offer stands. They do communicate with this LOA a lot.

8) Conservation Permit Numbers (Action)

Alan Clark, Wildlife Section Chief, presented this agenda item. Mr. Clark said that Greg Sheehan will present the audit section of this item. Mr. Clark said he would go through the history of the program, then what the Division has done relative to changes in the rule, the application process, the results, the final Division recommendations and then a review of what the rule says relative to the Board's role in recommending permits.

The program started in 1981 with one permit marketed by the Division. In 2005, this program generated over one and one half million dollars for the standard permits and another 260,000 for the resolution permits. He then went over a handout on the Conservation Permit Audit - Executive Summary (See Attachment #2). The money generated by these tags is entirely used for special projects and programs, with a little bit on research and some on transplants.

This is a rule that has changed a lot. It has been modified at least four times in the last six years. He would like to see one more change completed, as directed by the Board, to look at getting five year conservation permits. Before each rule change, we have held meetings with the conservation organizations. Mr. Clark then summarized the rule changes that have taken place.

Mr. Clark then went over the application process. He said that they never look at any application until they finish doing the performance factors. They go through the tag awarding in

a very methodical way. He then turned the time over to Mr. Sheehan.

Internal Audit Presentation - 2005 Conservation Permits

Greg Sheehan presented this section. He thanked Ashley Moretti for doing most of the work on this audit. Beginning in 2004 the Division performed an internal audit of the conservation organizations to ensure that revenues generated were being accounted for, separate bank accounting of the funds was present, project approval forms were being prepared and signed, and unexpended funds were accounted for. The 2005 internal audits were completed. The Division identified many areas that both the conservation organizations and the Division needed to make some changes and improvement. The revenues, bank accounts, project forms, and fund balances were reviewed. The Division has not had the resources to perform detailed audits of each of the expenditures of the various projects. The audit was not conducted in accordance with generally accepted audits standards. This is basically an internal audit and we are auditing ourselves as part of this. We are not truly a disinterested third party. Mr. Sheehan then went over the Conservation Permit Audit Executive Summary - (see attachment #2). Overall the amount of money brought in was accounted for. They are working with the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation on getting the Utah money in a separate account, rather than with their general fund in Montana.

The internal audit recommendation is based on the information reviewed in the internal audit. We have not seen information to indicate that any of the conservation organizations should be precluded from obtaining 2006 conservation permits. At the discretion of the Wildlife Board we may perform more detailed audits of expenditures, but those may take two to three months, or an independent audit function could perform these reviews. This concluded the presentation on the audit.

Mr. Diamond said a lot of time has been spent on this audit. Funds cannot be co-mingled, so RMEF needs to get things squared around. He does not believe for a minute that there is a problem with RMEF, but in terms of what is right and we are making these other organizations keep separate accounts, everybody needs to play by the same rules. This process may take years to establish a certain way of doing this audit. He does not want to put more pressure on the Division, but as they are able to take on more of the aspects of it, he would like them to do so. It may end up with an outside auditor at some point.

Mr. Sheehan said they have letters prepared, that identify the details, list project dollar amounts, and bank account balance amounts. It will be issued to the Board with follow up letters to the various groups. He asked if that is still the direction the Board wants to go?

Mr. Diamond said yes and they want the process to keep evolving.

Mr. Clark went on with the Conservation Permit numbers. Last year, one of the rule changes was limiting the growth in an organization=s permits. We had groups that qualified for more permits than they were allowed to have. In 2005, the MDF triggered the growth cap by qualifying for more than a 100% increase in their permits over 2004. Mr. Clark went on to explain how this was handled with the negotiation process. For 2006, we had two groups initially trigger the growth cap, NWTF and Safari Club. They followed the same process and negotiated which permits they would get. After that, the permit would fall to the next group. When they finished that negotiation, a third group, MDF triggered their growth cap. The Division also negotiated with them and settled on the number of permits. After the negotiations were finished, they sent the permit awards out. At this point, the rule allows the groups to complete trades amongst themselves. They did a lot of trading and several of the permits were traded more than once. The summary sheet reflects the outcome after all the trades were completed, with the exception of the two swan permits.

Mr. Clark went on to cover some other issues. There was an application from a second Safari CLUB International chapter, which the Division rejected, because the rule says only one application per organization. There was a request from the MDF for two additional statewide conservation permits for their event in Reno. The Division rejected this request based on the rule since the event is not in Utah. MDF requested a season extension on statewide deer permit that was rejected because the rule does not allow season extensions on conservation permits.

MDF, SFH, and FNAWS submitted five year requests. The Division rejected MDF and SFH because this is not consistent with rule. FNAWS= request was not timely since they still have one year still to go on their last five year request. There was a request from FNAWS for additional area conservation permits for new hunts in 2006. This is something the Board has dealt with before, so the Division has no recommendation on that.

Mr. Clark then went over the role of the Wildlife Board. They can award to a group if it is not recommended by the Division after considering the criteria in the rule, R657-41-4(12). Those criteria are the benefit to species; historical contribution of the organization to the conservation of wildlife in Utah; previous performance of the conservation organization; and the overall viability and integrity of the conservation permit program.

In summary, Mr. Clark said there are 376 conservation permits included in this year=s recommendations, not counting the additional requests. The bids for the permits are 1.3 million dollars. The return to the Division, based on the past, will be about 1.6 million dollars. This concluded the presentation. This did not go through the RACs since they are not involved in the bidding process.

Mr. Perkins asked that on the additional permits requested by FNAWs for the two new hunts, does the Division intend to recommend two sheep on those initial hunts, one of which would be public and one conservation?

Mr. Clark said yes, if they are approved.

Mr. Perkins asked if that area conservation permit brings a return of funds just like the others?

Mr. Clark said yes.

Public Comment

Byron Bateman, President of SFH, thanked the Board for working through the conservation tag process last year and for the resolution permits. He said this is a great opportunity to generate money for wildlife. He would like to see it worked on to eliminate some of the problems. All conservation groups worked together this year. SFH's books are always open for audit with an appointment. They put the permit money back to work as quickly as they can get to work for wildlife. The intent of the program is to benefit wildlife.

Tony Abbott, MDF said they had a lot of tags again this year and they needed to be distributed back. They traded away those they could not use for the best interest of the future of the program. Some were permits MDF did end up with, including a statewide Rocky Mountain bighorn permit that will be marketed for their national convention in Reno this year. The convention is being held in conjunction with FNAWs. MDF sold the state deer and moose for all time highs last year. There was a compromise made amongst the groups this year in dealing with the permits that the Division did not have to do, in hopes that this next year they can make a long term deal. All the MDF funds are planned to be used for habitat. He hopes that this process will be worked on and cleared up for next year.

Don Peay said he has two issues, one for SFH and one for FNAWs. As far as the auditing goes, it is good to see where the money is going, but he has a word of caution. When they can send a check directly to the federal land agencies or directly to contracts, it can save them 20-30% by not going through the bureaucracy. The conservation money goes onto the ground and SFH spends a lot of additional money working on resource management plans, etc. They will spend \$50-60 thousand dollars on the Henry Mountains BLM resource management plan. It is going to be a big project, requiring a lot of work and travel time. None of that comes from conservation permit money, but from additional membership funds. On the Henry Mountain permit, it does not specify which season. They would like this to be a premium tag to see what a hunter could

do if they could hunt all three seasons.

Mr. Peay then went onto the FNAWS proposal. The Stansbury transplant was approved today. They spent a lot of money getting this done and none of it is figured into the work they have done. Utah FNAWS would like to have a permit the first year in a drawing for people who come to the FNAWS fund raisers. They would do one draw tag and one auction tag, one Little Rockies and one New Foundland Mountains, asking for two permits this year and two next year. FNAWS does a lot more than just raise money and turn it over. They spend a lot of time and effort for sheep.

Director Karpowitz said there is no such thing as a premium deer tag. There are premium units. The Board would have to do a variance for a tag to be good all three seasons.

Mr. Clark said he has gotten requests from other groups for variances recently and has told them no. The rule is clear in his mind about variances. The only thing that is different about the Henry Mountains tag is there is only one area tag, but three types of hunts. Mr. Clark's recommendation would be to not grant all three if a variance was done. This is not an option under the rule. Anything that is referred to as a variance has to be asked for when the application is submitted. They have told people no if they have asked for changes since then.

Mr. Bushman said the Conservation Permit Rule is straight forward. It states, with respect to applications for conservation permits that it has to be submitted by September 1st and it has to include certain information. Information includes any permits being requested, name, address, etc., but also it states that any requested variance for an extended season or legal weapon choice for the area conservation permits. If there is a variance it needs to be submitted with the application. What is being requested is to swap an any weapon permit and change it to archery or muzzleloader permit. That is the way he reads and interprets the rule.

Mr. Diamond said they do not have a choice unless they want to violate the rule.

Chairman Bowns read the FNAWS request. For the 2006 season, FNAWS proposes one permit from each unit, the Little Rockies and the New Foundland Mountains be available to Utah FNAWS for resident hunters who attend and apply in person at the Utah FNAWS fund raising event in Salt Lake City on March 5, 2006. There would then be one permit on each unit in the normal DWR drawing. For the 2007 season, if there are hunting permits, FNAWS requests one permit from each unit again on the Little Rockies and the New Foundland Mountains that will be auctioned at the super convention.

Mr. Clark said we should just deal with the 2006 permits at this point. We are going to have a

lot of convention permits and many requests for permits that will come in for the convention, including additional statewide tags.

Director Karpowitz said there was no bid attached to those, so they become the minimum bid of \$20,000, is that right?

Mr. Peay said he agrees with the notion of just dealing with 2006. They do not want to auction these tags. The tags will be part of a drawing at the FNAWS Convention. They will not raise \$20,000 at \$5 each, one time each.

Director Karpowitz asked what we do about the rule that says the minimum is \$20,000.

Mr. Clark said they can only issue conservation permits at this point. We do not tell the organizations how to market the permits, but we hold them accountable to the return.

Director Karpowitz asked Mr. Bushman to address the two sheep permits that would be given through a drawing with no bid associated with them.

Mr. Bushman said the minimum bid has to be \$20,000 for an area conservation sheep tag. How they go about raising the money would be up to them.

Director Karpowitz asked if the Board has the authority to change that without a rule change.

Mr. Bushman said he would look at the rule, but he does not think so.

Mr. Peay said they could just auction them this year and do the draw next year.

The following motion was made by Lee Howard, seconded by Paul Niemeyer and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we grant the request of FNAWS for two 2006 permits, one for the Little Rockies and one for the New Foundland Mountains.

The following motion was made by Dick Diamond, seconded by Allan Smith and passed with one abstention, Lee Howard.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Conservation Permit Numbers as presented by the Division.

9) Dedicated Hunter Program Rule R657-38 & Fees Rule R-657-42 (Action)

Jill West, DWR Volunteer Program Coordinator presented this item. This year they tried to keep the changes to the program to a minimum. There were two issues that seemed to come up again and again that they want to address. The first issue is that in all the years of making changes, they have made things more complicated than intended. They have tried to do some things to make the program more hunter friendly. The second issue is that despite all of the great projects and service, there is a bit of an image problem with the program. They want to spell out some higher standards so everybody knows that these hunters are a cut above the run of the mill hunters.

Ms. West started with the more substantial changes. The enrollment period will be made concurrent with the big game drawing. These will make just one planning period for big game hunts. For people in the military, there will be an additional option. Currently, if a Dedicated Hunter is deployed he is able to apply for a refund. The other option will be to AOpt-out@ while deployed, and resume upon return.

Higher ethical standards for Dedicated Hunters were then outlined. First, hunters on revocation anywhere may not join. Second, however many years their hunting privileges were revoked, they must wait that number of years to demonstrate A good behavior@ to re-enroll after a revocation period. Third, if someone is convicted of specific major wildlife offenses, within five years previous to applying, they will not be allowed to participate in the program. There is a list of sixteen of these offenses in the rule. Another change is if anyone has had a COR suspended by the Division, they would like to have the chance to review the situation and disqualify a hunter from the program if they deem necessary. They also will hold those already in the program to these same standards. A clause was added to the rule stating that if you have your hunting privileges revoked, it would cause an automatic suspension of your Dedicated Hunter COR. A new category was added for people who submit fraudulent time sheets or sign the RAC rolls for people who do not attend the meetings. This program should be fair and those who do the work and fulfill the requirements are entitled to this increased hunting opportunity. Those who are cheating the system should have some sort of consequences.

In terms of the actual permits, they wanted to increase the flexibility of exchanges and surrenders for people in the program. Currently, people are allowed to exchange or surrender their permit prior to the archery season. Because the archery hunt is statewide, they would like to extend this opportunity so that as long as permits are available over the counter, people would be allowed to exchange for open region permits up until the first day of the muzzleloader season. In order to accommodate these exchanges after the archery season has begun, it is necessary to amend Fees

Rule R-657-42. They propose adding one line into the rule that says: AAny person who has obtained a Dedicated Hunter permit may exchange that permit for any other available Dedicated Hunter permit as provided in the Dedicated Hunter Rule.@

The last change has to do with the RAC requirement. They are proposing that this be an either/or requirement. Prior to receiving the second permit in the program, Dedicated Hunters must either attend a RAC meeting, or perform or purchase four additional service hours, or donate goods and services in the amount of the purchase price for those four service hours.

There were also some housekeeping changes that were done on the rule.

Lee Howard had a question about if the rule includes the felony clause.

Ms. West said that clause is not in the rule. She said the DH program is not planning on running background checks on the applications.

RAC Recommendations

Northern - Mr. Perkins said they moved to adopt as presented.

Central - Mr. Kent said they handled it in two motions. They were adamant about keeping the RAC meeting requirement and it was passed by a majority vote. The RAC approved the remaining DH rule changes as proposed by the Division unanimously.

Southern - Mr. Small said they accepted the Division=s recommendations unanimously.

Northeastern -Mr. Hamann said the RAC thought that being able to purchase all the time turns the program into something that people can just pay for. It makes it so there is not a lot of dedication left in the program. There was a proposal to accept the changes as presented, except for the buy off of service time and also the RAC time. After extensive discussion that motion was withdrawn. The motion was finally made to approve as presented and it passed unanimously.

Southeastern - Mr. Gilson said they had a motion to keep the RAC meeting requirement, and not allow convicted felons to enter the program. They then approved the remainder of the proposal as presented.

Mr. Niemeyer said he feels strongly about keeping the RAC meeting requirement. Anybody can make it to one meeting in three years. He thinks it helps people gain a better understanding of

how the process actually works.

Mr. Smith said he also agrees that they should be required to attend one RAC meeting in three years.

The following motion was made by Keele Johnson, seconded by Paul Niemeyer and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Dedicated Hunter Program Rule R657-38 and Fees Rule R-657-42 as presented by the Division, but retain the RAC meeting requirement.

Mr. Johnson commended the Division for all the work they have done to make the Dedicated Hunter Program more customer friendly.

10) Hunter Education Program Rule R657-23 nonresident blue card fee

Lenny Rees, DWR Hunter Education Program Coordinator, presented this agenda item. He said the proposed change on this rule will require legislative mandate. It is a fee change. He is requesting input from the Wildlife Board today. This proposal would put a fee on a transfer card for hunter education being transferred from another state to the state of Utah. Utah does recognize all hunter education programs from all the states and the Canadian provinces at this time. It is required that people who move into Utah and become a resident, transfer their hunter education certification to Utah so their files will be here.

RAC Recommendation

All of the RACs approved the Division's recommendations unanimously.

Mr. Niemeyer asked if the legislature will decide on the appropriate fee.

Mr. Rees said it is his understanding that we are looking at a \$10 fee which would go along with the duplicate hunter education card.

The following motion was made by Lee Howard, seconded by Rick Woodard and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Hunter Education Program Rule R657-23

nonresident blue card fee.

11) Minimum Hunting Age Proposed Changes (Action)

Lenny Rees presented this agenda item. He said that the population of the state of Utah is now 2.5 million. He showed a chart that indicated that license sales have been fairly stagnant from 2000 to 2004. We have gone from 225,000 low to 247,000 high. The graph on youth small game license sales showed a considerable drop from 2000 to 2003. In 2004, we did improve 100 licenses. Only approximately 3,000 youth are hunting small game animals in the state of Utah.

Mr. Rees went on to say that eight of the western states do not have a minimum game to hunt small game. Big game is pretty well 12 years of age over the Board. Utah, at 14, is the most restricted state. Mr. Rees showed a report on hunting accidents for hunters under 12 years old for small game and hunters under 14 years old for big game 2000-2004. It is very difficult to get a comprehensive report. This table showed very minimal numbers.

The Division's proposal is to make it possible for young hunters to purchase a small game license as soon as a person is capable of completing a hunter education course and their parents feel they are ready to hunt. There would be no minimum age to purchase a small game license. Code 23-20-20 states that a person under the age of sixteen must be accompanied by an adult while hunting with weapon. This gives the hunter a mentoring program with the accompanying adult.

The proposal for big game is that a person 11 years of age may purchase a permit to hunt big game if that person's 12th birthday falls within the calendar year for which the permit is issued. The hunter education requirement and also with the parent's or legal guardian's approval also apply for big game. Code 23-20-20 is a real key to this proposal. This concluded the presentation.

RAC Recommendations

Southern - Mr. Small said they had three motions. They accepted the age limit as proposed for big game hunts - 5 to 2. The opposition was mostly that it would add more people putting into the hunts and lower the odds of drawing out. They also had a motion that electronic devices are not acceptable as a means of communication. This passed 6 to 1. The age limit for small game should be set at age 10 years old and taking the class should be at the discretion of the hunter education teacher - passed unanimously.

Central - Mr. Kent said they had two motions. They addressed the big game age and it passed 6

to 1. Big game hunting is a more controlled situation, with parents having hands on direction. The second motion was dealing with the small game age limit and the motion was to retain the age at 12 years - passed 4 to 3.

Northern - Mr. Perkins said their RAC looked at the Youth Hunting Report which says that hunter recruitment is directly related to the restrictions that the state puts on youth hunting. It also says that there is no significant safety implication. Mr. Rees' data showed that small game hunting is more dangerous than big game. Their RAC had two motions. One to remove age restrictions on big game hunting. The second motion was that supervision by parents of children be close, not binoculars or walkie talkies.

Northeastern - Mr. Hamann said the motion to approve failed 2 to 4. Some of the concerns were by changing the big game age, it could roughly double those putting in for the OIAL and limited entry hunts. The motion that was passed was to accept the small game proposal after successfully completing hunter education with parents permission and the big game age stay at 14 - passed 4 to 2. They would prefer to do this change in an graduated effort and perhaps start out with just deer on big game. It might not be good to do this all at once. This change might compound the problem of party hunting where someone shoots the deer when another has the permit. As a result, it might teach the youth that it is okay to violate the law.

Southeastern - Derris Jones said they voted to accept the Division's proposal as presented - passed 6 to 4. They did get into a lot of discussion on 23-20-20 on using walkie-talkies and electronic devices for communication. Someone did point out that during the archery hunts, it is easier for the adult to be back a ways from the youth hunter.

Public Comment

Tony Abbott with MDF said he took his eleven year old son to hunt in New Mexico. He put in for a deer hunt and got one of five permits. His son looked forward to this opportunity throughout the summer. They had a great experience. He had this opportunity with his Dad and was safe. This experience was priceless. Speaking for the MDF, if we do not get youth involved at a younger age, it is not going to happen. They strongly encourage doing this change.

Byron Bateman, SFH said this is important for hunter recruitment. We need to get them out and involved in the outdoors. It is a great experience to take them out hunting. He hunted with his grandson this year and is excited to hunt in the future. Opportunities are boundless that we can give these kids. They will be the future of hunting. We have to get them involved and train them as conservationists for the future.

John Leonard, NWTF president said they are in favor of preserving our hunter heritage. He provided a study about engaging youth now and getting them into hunting. The least restrictive states are the most successful at getting youth involved. Safety with a supervised young hunter is not a factor. He urged the Board to remove the minimum age restrictions. He feels it is disturbing that hunters would see kids as competition. This is a selfish and short sighted viewpoint.

Chairman Bowns summarized the RAC recommendations. They would discuss the use of electronic devices for communication first.

Mr. Johnson asked if there is already a regulation on electronic devices.

Mr. Rees said that 23-20-20 states that Accompanied means at a distance within which visual and verbal communication is maintained for the purpose of advising and assisting.@ There is not anything in rule about electronic devices.

Mr. Niemeyer asked what about close enough for verbal communication without the use of electronic devices.

Chairman Bowns said the Southern RAC proposed that an electronic device is not accepted as a means of communication.

The following motion was made by Paul Niemeyer, seconded by Lee Howard and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that electronic devices not be used as a substitute for direct (face to face) verbal communication relative to supervision of youth hunters.

The following motion was made Keele Johnson, seconded by Dick Diamond and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Minimum Hunting Age Proposed Changes as presented by the Division.

Director Karpowitz said that this is a code change and it has to go to the legislature. The Board has made a recommendation on what will go to the legislature. They have pre-filed a bill in the upland game section. They did not do anything on the big game part, because they did not know what the Board would do. He does not know whether they can get the big game portion done

this year. It may take another legislative session.

12) Variance Requests (Action)

Judi Tutorow, DWR Licensing Program Coordinator presented these variances. (See Attachment # 3 for details)

Tony Abbott presented the following request. Gregg Abdoe is requesting an extension on his any weapon Paunsaungunt buck deer permit for next year.

Mr. Smith asked if the Board has legal authority on this.

Ms. Tutorow said yes.

The following motion was made by Dick Diamond, seconded by Allan Smith and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we grant the extension of the 2005 any weapon Paunsaungunt buck deer permit for Gregg Abdoe.

Robert R. Phelps is requesting an extension on his 2005 Mt Dutton, any legal weapon bull elk permit for next year.

The following motion was made by Dick Diamond, seconded by Paul Niemeyer and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we grant the extension of the 2005 Mt. Dutton any weapon bull elk permit for Robert Phelps.

Christopher Abkarian is requesting an extension on his 2005 antlerless deer, West Bear River permit for next year.

The following motion was made by Dick Diamond, seconded by Keele Johnson and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we grant the extension of the 2005 antlerless deer, West Bear River permit for Christopher Abkarian.

Gary A Hill is requesting an extension on his 2005 Zion (b) Turkey Merriam=s permit for next year.

The following motion was made by Lee Howard, seconded by Paul Niemeyer and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we grant the extension of the 2005 Zion (b) Merriam=s turkey permit for Gary A. Hill.

Mike and Michael McCarey are requesting an extension on their 2005 general buck deer permits for Northern region for next year. The permits were surrendered before the hunt started.

The following motion was made by Keele Johnson, seconded by Rick Woodard and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we grant the extension of the 2005 Northern Region general buck deer permits for Mike and Michael Mccarey.

Hector & Wanda Gonzalez are requesting an extension on their 2005 Conservation Cougar permit for Central and Southern Region for next year.

The following motion was made by Lee Howard, seconded by Allan Smith and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we grant the extension of the 2005 Central and Southern Region Conservation Cougar permits for Hector and Wanda Gonzalez.

9) Other Business

1) Ken Sheldon Stipulation

Mr. Marty Bushman addressed the Board. This is a stipulation on a suspension as an appeal from the suspension issued by the Division. The petitioner is Ken Sheldon. He was convicted of trespass and was suspended for a year. He was on a road in Duchesne County that was going through private property and then there is a fork in the road that breaks off to the left. That road, for many years has been open. The private property owners gated the forked road off and Mr. Sheldon took exception with that, feeling that it was a public road by virtue of use. He parked his car off the side of the road on private property and went up the road from the fork, through a cut in the fence and got onto the forked road and headed across. He was suspended for a year. This occurred in July which takes away both big game hunting seasons. Part of agreement was that the Division would reduce the suspension period to 170 days so he could put in for the

next year. The intent of this recommendation is to impact one season as opposed to two.

The following motion was made by Keele Johnson, seconded by Dick Diamond and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we grant the stipulation for Ken Sheldon, reducing his suspension from 365 days to 171 days.

2) 2006 Meeting Dates

Chairman Bowns went over the schedule for 2006 Wildlife Board meetings. (See Attachment #4) The April 28 meeting was changed to April 27. All the meetings are on Thursdays. Chairman Bowns said that the Board members need to make arrangements for WAFWA if they will be attending, and they also need check and update their e-mails addresses, fax numbers and phone numbers that are in their packets.

The meeting was adjourned.